

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

9. (AMENDED) The apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said processor and said [programable] programmable logic device are implemented on a single die.

17. (AMENDED) The method according to claim 15, further comprising the steps of:

(C) during a first bootup, configuring said [programable] programmable logic device as said processor in
5 response to instructions stored in said memory circuit; and

(D) reprogramming said memory circuit in response to said programming signals.

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The objection to claim 9 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn. The objection to claim 16 appears to be directed to claim 17 and, therefore, has been obviated by appropriate amendment. As such, the objections to the claims should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Deming et al. '486 (hereinafter Deming) in view of Wang et al. '820 (hereinafter Wang) is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deming and Wang as applied to claims 1 and 18 and further in view of Esnouf '108 (hereinafter Esnouf) is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Deming is directed to a method and apparatus for in system programming of a programmable logic device using a two wire interface.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention (claim 1) provides a wireless transceiver coupled to a programmable logic circuit, where the programmable logic circuit comprises a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package. Claims 15 and 18 include similar recitations. The Office admits that Deming fails to teach or suggest a programmable logic circuit where the programmable logic circuit comprises a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package (see page 2, paragraph no. 5, last five lines of the Office Action). Therefore, Deming does not teach or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over Deming.

Wang does not cure the deficiencies of Deming. Wang is directed to a fast locking phase frequency detector. Despite the position taken in the Office Action, Wang does not teach a programmable logic circuit wherein said programmable logic circuit comprises a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in **a single integrated circuit package**, as presently claimed (see page 2, last two lines through page 3, lines 1-3 of the Office Action). In particular, Wang explicitly states that FIG. 1 shows a block diagram of a digital system that may be provided on **a single board, on multiple boards**, or even within **multiple enclosures**. Since Wang is directed to a system which is

provided on a single board or on multiple boards or even within multiple enclosures, Wang clearly is not suggestive of a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit **in a single integrated circuit package**, as presently claimed. Furthermore, the inclusion of fixed and flexible disk media and PC card flash disk memory as examples of devices represented by the memory 105 in FIG. 1 of Wang further evidences that Wang does not teach or suggest a single integrated circuit package, as presently claimed (FIG. 1 and column 3, lines 61-65 of Wang). Therefore, Wang does not cure the deficiencies of Deming. Thus, Deming and Wang, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Esnouf does not cure the deficiencies of Wang and Deming. Esnouf is directed to a game apparatus. Esnouf appears silent regarding a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package, as presently claimed. As such, Esnouf does not and cannot cure the deficiencies of Deming or Wang. Therefore, neither Deming, Wang nor Esnouf, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14, 16-17 and 19-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15 and 18 which are believed to be allowable. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 17, the statement of reasons for the rejection of claim 17 does not appear to be adequate in allowing applicant to judge the propriety of continuing the prosecution of claim 17. Specifically, the position in the Office Action that the rationale for rejecting claims 10 and 15 is applicable to claim 17 does not appear to adequately address each and every element of claim 17 (see page 6, paragraph no. 19 of the Office Action). In particular, claim 17 is directed to a method and provides steps of (i) during a first bootup, configuring a programmable logic device as a processor in response to instructions stored in a memory circuit and (ii) reprogramming the memory circuit in response to programming signals. Claim 15 does not recite such steps. Claim 10 is directed to an apparatus and is silent such steps. Therefore, the rejection of claim 17 on page 6, paragraph no. 19 of the Office Action does not clearly explain how each and every element of Claim 17 is met by the cited references as required under 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Therefore, the Office Action fails to meet the Office's burden of factually establish a *prima*

facia case of obviousness with respect to claim 17 and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.



Robert M. Miller
Registration No. 42,892
24025 Greater Mack, Suite 200
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
(586) 498-0670

Dated: January 20, 2003

Docket No.: 0325.00372